

**ENFIELD HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE  
BUDGET SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
February 26, 2015**

A meeting of the Enfield High School Building Budget Sub-Committee was held at Enfield High School located at 1264 Enfield Street, Enfield, Connecticut on February 26, 2015.

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm by Randy Daigle

**2. ROLL CALL:**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Randy Daigle, Walter Kruzel, Doug Maxellon, Jim Nasuta, Greg Strich

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Virginia Austin, Joe Muller

**ALSO PRESENT**

Art Pongratz, Peter Manning, Dean Petrucelli, Amar Shamas

Randy Daigle appoints the two alternates as regular voting members for the February 26, 2015 meeting.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Motion made by Walter Kruzel to Accept the Budget Sub-Committee Minutes Dated February 12, 2015

Seconded by Doug Maxellon

Abstained by Randy Daigle, Jim Nasuta

Motion passes by a show of hands

**4. OLD BUSINESS:**

Discussion and Authorization of Silver Petrucelli & Associates, and Gilbane Building Company to proceed in the design, and negotiated costs for new window systems (to match the new, and renovate to new façade) on the Library/Main Office addition, at an estimated cost of \$100,000.00 (tabled on January 8, 2015) – **Table**

Review, Discussion and Approval for the Town Manager to enter into an agreement with Gilbane Building Company, for F, F, & E, and Move Management Services, as described in the Proposal, dated January 28, 2015, in the amount of \$89,710.00 (tabled on February 12, 2015)

Art states this service is not a part of the CMR agreement.

Randy states initially we were going to try to take that upon ourselves. It is typically not part of the CMR responsibility. Initially we were hoping to do it with staff.

Doug states we need someone. Would it make sense to go out and get some proposals on it other than Gilbane? We have their rates. I'm sure there are companies that do that.

Randy states I don't have a problem if the majority wants to do that. Based on the hours for that dollar amount I don't see a savings. They are actually doing it at a bone rate if you look at it.

Doug states this isn't the move.

Art states it is the management of the move. You'd really have to find someone that has a unique set of abilities. You'd be looking at another construction manager person, people who have both those skills.

Doug asks beyond the management what else is in this package?

Walter asks if Art sent out the email to answer Doug's question.

Art states yes.

Walter read the email dated February 6, 2015.

Art show Doug the proposal.

Art states the scope of their services is pretty broad. It is because our moving is phased. It happens is a lot of different phases, also. You're talking about someone coming on board infrequently over the next two years for short bursts of time. It wouldn't lend itself to be attractive.

Amar states these services involves procurement of the shop, FFE, going through the submittals, send those for approval. It talks about procurement. The bidding requirements for it, issuing contracts, doing pre bids, issuing RFP's for proposals for move management and also developing the FFE purchases. It's going to be done in multiple stages, as far as the move management and the FFE purchases. It also includes the engineering to develop all the shop drawings for all the equipment. Just like we do for submittals on electrical or mechanical it includes that effort as well. It dove tails getting the equipment installed in each phase that we need. It also includes the PCT. You could go to a diversified management but that is all they do is move management. It doesn't include all the other parts and pieces of it in terms of purchasing the equipment, getting the equipment. It's a mixed bag of services. It's not just pure moving.

Doug asks if this is a fixed number?

Amar states we put it in as an allowance right now. We projected a certain amount of hours as a best effort to put the scope together. The challenge of it is, depending on the move, we assumed only a certain amount of Fermi is moving in here. That could change. If the FFE becomes 10 packages that we have to procure, again, a lot of it was based on assumption. We will draw against the allowance, if we do well the rest of it goes back. It is fair for both sides.

Doug asks if we can do 'Not to Exceed'?

Art states the hard part is if we find more rocks we buy less FFE, we will be moving more furniture over from Fermi.

Doug states that's bad because we don't have the money for either.

Jim asks Amar to explain the travel expense.

Peter states what we figured was there was 40 trips over the life of the project.

Randy states it's not like someone is here waiting for this to happen, it's on demand.

Amar states she will be up here meeting with Art or with Andy.

Jim states he doesn't see it starting March 1<sup>st</sup>.

Amar states March 1<sup>st</sup> she will be here working on the first move in August, we have to develop the bid packages. We have to sit and start figuring out the moving matrix. In March, once the FFE packages are out we have to put the package out for the equipment that goes out into Fermi. Which is the shop area, we have to put that package out, too.

Randy asks what is the lead time on furniture?

Dean states it will vary depending on which phase and which piece.

Amar states in the cafeteria wing, if you're looking at August you have to go out to bid. You have to get the pricing, assemble the pricing, present it to Art and the committee. Then issue contracts. That's why we targeted the March start, you don't want to be too late. When the FFE award is made we have to submit catalog cuts and submittals.

Jim states so the 88,360, we're going to be paying \$2240.00 a month for travel.

Amar states no for the duration.

Peter states on the next page is a matrix of the labor.

Jim states thank you, that's what he was looking for.

Motion made by Walter Kruzel to Approve for the Town Manager to enter into agreement with Gilbane Building Company for FFE and Move Management Services, as described in the Proposal, dated January 28, 2015, in the amount of \$89,710.00

Seconded by Greg Strich

Motion passes by a show of hands

## **5. NEW BUSINESS:**

Motion made by Walter Kruzel to Approve HAKS Engineers, P.C., Invoice Number CT0283-013, dated February 17, 2015, in the amount of \$4,845.91

Seconded by Doug Maxellon

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Walter Kruzel to Approve Gilbane Building Company, Invoice Number 19, dated February 26, 2015, in the amount of \$1,103,856.24

Seconded by Jim Nasuta

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Walter Kruzel to Approve Silver Petrucelli & Associates Invoice Number 15-528, dated February 28, 2015, in the amount of \$52,789.80

Seconded by Doug Maxellon

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Walter Kruzel to Approve Goosetown Communications, Quote Number 3081, dated January 14, 2015, in the amount of \$2,160.00

Art states it is for the antenna to Headstart.

Jim asks if it is ours?

Art states we caused it.

Greg states if we designed the building differently, it wouldn't have happened.

Seconded by Greg Strich

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Walter Kruzel to Add to the Agenda item number 5 f, HAKS Engineering, P.C., Invoice number CT0283-015, Dated February 12, 2015 in the amount of \$6,915.50

Seconded by Greg Strich

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Walter Kruzel to Approve HAKS Engineering P.C., Invoice number CT-0283-015, dated February 12, 2015 in the amount of \$6,915.50

Seconded by Greg Strich

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Walter Kruzel to Approve ATP-0027 Add - \$1,492.00 – Sheer Wall Footing at Stair 2 Shear Walls

Seconded by Greg Strich

Doug asks if we will vote on each one. Some are quotes and fixed.

Jim has questions on some, as well.

Randy states these are authorizations to proceed. They are not fixed until submitted. It is allowing them to proceed to do the work.

Doug asks what are they? The changes don't say what happened to get to this point.

Dean states stair 2 the main stair inner wall between the stair and the corridor, originally through design we had that as a glass wall and during the last effort of value engineering we changed that to a 4 story masonry wall to save on the dollars of rated glass. When we switch from a glass wall to a masonry wall our structural engineer never picked up the footing underneath that wall. An RFI came out before they poured the slabs saying don't you want a footing underneath the masonry wall and our structural engineer said yes.

Jim states just to clarify, this is just an authorization to proceed.

Amar states this is a fixed cost.

Dean states this one in particular we have signed off on. We feel it is fair value. Some are approved should get off the docket.

Amar states that is the final cost for that footing. Dean is correct, it will move to a change order and won't show up on the agenda again. This is a fixed number, final number.

Randy states we will approve this as an ATP now and once it's done then you submit it as a change order.

Dean states it won't show up on your agenda again, you'll only see ATP's you'll never see change orders.

Amar states we will eventually have a change order that's submitted but these ATP's, if everyone is comfortable with that number, then that ATP becomes a change order.

Doug states if it's an ATP that's open-ended, it comes back next month.

Dean states correct.

Walter states there is a 'fixed' box and 'estimate' box. This one says fixed.

Motion passes by a show of hands.

Motion made by Walter Kruzel to Approve ATP0028 Add - \$16,429.00 – Electrical Vault

Amar states that is the final number as well.

Dean states prior to bid we had numerous meeting with CL&P. This is for the transformer out by the tennis court. They were fine with leaving the transformer and pad in place. After bid they changed their mind and wanted to replace the transformer. They own the transformer but we needed to provide the pad, manholes to pull and make the connections. This is the post bid request by the utility company.

Doug states they also added in the handholes in the primary run in the back.

Jim asks they weren't in there originally?

Amar states they did not want concrete they wanted the quazite/Hubbell. We backed out the concrete.

Jim states the price they have quoted in there is high, very high.

Amar states I appreciate the feedback. If you see a number and I'll be glad to look. If you see something, please get in touch with me. I appreciate your feedback, I really do.

Doug asks if there is an MEP person who reviews these and verifies prices?

Amar states we have an MEP coordinator.

Jim asks what labor level are they going on their change orders?

Amar states we have NECA column line one for the addition and column line two for the renovations.

Doug asks if he checked that against the changes?

Amar states yes.

Doug states on the changes, obviously we know electrical better than the other ones and we are just at the beginning of the project. Between last meeting and this meeting we're going to approve almost three quarters of a million dollars in changes. There should be somebody checking the prices of the sub-contractors.

Randy states that's what they do. If you guys are available I have no problem with you going to a contractor and justifying them. We're all on here for specific reasons, this is where you guys come in. I have no problem you going to the meetings.

Amar states we put the best effort forward along with Dean's office to evaluate these changes and pricing. If there is something that you see that does not look in line, flag it. I appreciate that.

Doug asks about the disclaimer about delay and the impact cost.

Amar states we combat that very easily. When put a final settlement on every change order. It is an amendment to them. That supercedes that document.

Randy states this is your expertise, Doug. Feel free to go to the meetings.

Amar states we need to release the work. You can say proceed with the work, subject to review.

Jim states I know numbers and I estimate every day.

Peter states I suggest you approve it with 'not to exceed' and we'll go back with your comments.

Jim will write his comments.

Walter Amends his Motion to say Not To Exceed

Seconded by Doug Maxellon

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Walter Kruzel to Approve ATP-0031 Add - \$2,579.00 – Modification to C-2 Support Column

Dean states this is a column in the cafeteria. There is a beam in the cafeteria that our structural engineers were preserving that was concealed above the ceiling. They assumed it was being carried. When they took apart the wall it was load bearing on the masonry wall which was not what they assumed so we had to add a column to support the existing beam that needed to stay in place. It was an unforeseen

Amar states this is a final number.

Seconded by Jim Nasuta

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Walter Kruzel to Approve ATP-0032 Add - \$7,867.00 – End Wall Detail per SKS-20

Dean states this is on the Fermi wing. When you looking at the front elevation that is facing the parking lot there is one portion of the yellow that is not complete yet. There is an end detail that when structural design did it, it was designed as the exterior skin to be framed, and not steel but in light gauge framing. The cold form is by bid designed by a 3<sup>rd</sup> party. They came back and said they could not make the detail work without adding additional steel. It is a unique detail.

Amar states this is a fixed number.

Seconded by Greg Strich  
Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Walter Kruzel to Approve ATP-0033 Add - \$14,569.00 – Electrical Coordination Study/  
Revised Circuit Breakers

Seconded by Jim Nasuta

Dean states we called for a coordination study to be done because we're required to stipulate 3 manufacturers in our specifications. Our electrical engineers choose a basis of design, we ask once the manufacturer, in this case is GE, once the manufacturer is selected to run the coordination study. After GE, or whoever they hire to run the study for GE ran the coordination study they recommended that we increase a few of our breakers. Our engineers are struggling with this one, too. Obviously, we choose a basis of design that works. Every breaker has a subtle difference between them and when you put all these pieces and part from different manufacturers together we are requiring that they do this coordination study. The coordination study revealed that going to GE breakers and panels that you're going to need to modify the breaker that were originally detailed and specified. They also increased the panel to a third panel/fourth section. If you remember we value engineered that last section out as the end of the value engineering process because we were able to make it fit, we knew we were going to be tight. So we took our sections and reduced them and now we have to put them back in because of the GE breakers.

Jim states I'm still not satisfied with the answer of why the breakers needed to be changed. I need more explanation of that. If it was bid with a certain switchboard and certain breakers in the specs, why did we have to go with this other breaker?

Dean states because we are required by law to list 3 manufacturers.

Doug states from our sources, the breakers that Ferguson had in the panels in his submittals would work. What they did was upgrade the breaker.

Jim states changed the breaker to an adjustable trip breaker, and this was after the coordination study was done.

Doug states what we understand from our sources is the breakers that were in there would work. This is an upgrade.

Jim states per the recommendation from the coordination study, not your people.

Dean states we agree, it was recommended that we increase the breakers, we agree.

Doug states but it wasn't required. GE said it would work fine.

Dean states my understanding is GE said it would work.

Jim states it was the coordination study was not done by GE. The coordination study was done by a third party who came back and said we think you should put these breakers in. GE didn't feel that they were needed.

Randy asks do they have a right to say that? Is it a recommendation or is it something we need to do, or to get reimbursed?

Doug states it was a 3<sup>rd</sup> party coordination study, engineer, just made some recommendations after he does the coordination study. A coordination study takes all the breakers and all the electrical systems in the building and puts it all together so if you trip a little plug here it doesn't blow the main breaker.

Randy asks does your electrical consultant feel we should or shouldn't?

Dean states our electrical engineer agrees with these folks that obviously the original design we felt worked, obviously the GE breaker as the manufacturer we feel still works and as a professional engineer when we get a report back that says we strongly recommend or we highly recommend that we increase by going to these GE breakers, I know Doug is going to say that is not necessarily the case, but going to this set up, the set up that was selected by Ferguson, the third party consultant is saying we recommend you increase the breaker size. That is what the report is saying.

Doug states not the breaker size, the breaker type.

Dean agrees.

Randy states it's like buying a ford or buying a chevy, it's just who is manufacturing it?

Doug states we are not going to resolve this here. I'd like to Table.

Dean states this one is not yet approved, it is just an authorization to proceed. We have not approved the dollars.

Doug states let your engineer talk to the other engineer and if there is no logical reason, stay with what the design is and save ourselves \$14,000.00.

Randy states let me offer this to the committee, would you guys feel comfortable taking control over that? And, we'll follow your recommendations?

Doug states we could, we're giving you our recommendation, but for us to get involved, I'd rather not.

Jim states I would have any conversation with anyone from your office. We'll talk to your office. I don't want to get involved with the contractor.



Doug agrees. I don't feel it's right to get involved with Ferguson.

Dean states you have to understand our dilemma with these hundred pieces, and when you take these hundred pieces away and you have a hundred other pieces, we say you need to run a test, they run a test and they say with these new hundred pieces we recommend this. As a designer, we're going to say wait. This worked, you changed this to this and the report now says if you're going to do this we recommend you change the breaker.

Doug states you're both professional engineers, your guys and the other guy. They should be able to tech-y talk and work this out.

Greg asks is the problem the definition of 'or equal'?

Jim states no, it's nothing to do with or equal. It's a product manufactured by somebody who is in the spec but instead of a Taurus SE model you're getting the next model up, Taurus SHO.

Doug asks what your engineer spec'd works fine. That's the bottom line.

Jim states basically a Taurus SE was spec. The coordination engineer said no, I really thing you need a Taurus SHO. Getting to the middle is where we need to be.

Dean states, again, the dollars are not approved. I hear you're questioning if we should proceed.

Doug states right.

Amar states this fourth box was discussed at length with the design team and it's a critical piece of equipment. They did the coordination study and those are the recommendations that were made. We sent out the information, everyone was on board for releasing this piece of equipment. The price can be discussed.

Jim states that's fine and I think we said that about some of the others. My recommendation to the committee would be, do I approve this dollar amount? No. I would vote no right now.

Randy asks how do you justify the No vote? How do you know that this is not a good number?

Jim states I haven't seen the back-up to tell me why we went to this model breaker.

Randy states that is two different things. Justifying the model of breaker to a dollar amount.

Doug states there is labor that is excessive in here, too.

Dean states how about if our chief electrical engineer has a conversation with you two?

Doug and Jim agree.

Amar states just to be clear, the equipment has been released. The breakers have been released.

Doug states so we bought it.

Randy states if your concern is the dollar amount then let's talk about that.

Amar states you can approve it to Not Exceed.

Randy states if you're talking about the material, that's a done deal. If you're saying the dollar amount is wrong, then step up and look at.

Jim states he is questioning why did we need to go to that breaker? I understand why in theory, because their coordination study engineer that they hired which wasn't GE supply it was third party.

Doug states they all run it with the equipment they're using.

Randy states if we're talking about the ATP process, procedure and material that's a done deal. If you're saying the price is not correct, we're looking for you to step up and find out what it should be.

Doug states the only way would be we would have to get quotes on the breakers ourselves. To me the whole thing stem back to it shouldn't have gone forward to start with. I understand what you're saying and we're beyond that. Amar is right, it's already released, it's a formality. We're forced to approve it, basically for something we didn't have to spend the money on. The biggest chunk of it is the equipment. it's about \$8,200 worth of equipment.

Amar states this one is a fixed number.

Randy states we are approving it at this fixed number.

Walter asks if there is negotiation on the number?

Amar states we already went back.

Dean states we have not signed off on this number, yet.

Amar states then do to Not Exceed.

Motion made by Walter Kruzel to Amend his Motion Not To Exceed

Seconded by Doug Maxellon

Against: Doug Maxellon

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Walter Kruzel to Approve ATP-0034 – Add - \$2,220.00 – Thickened Slab Location at Auto Lifts

Seconded by Jim Nasuta

Dean states this has to do with 4 car lifts going in Auto Shop. Originally we were showing a 5 inch slab, the manufacturer is recommending having more concrete under the pad location. Some of those lifts are 2 posts, some are 4 post, so this deals with 4 different locations. This is a final, fixed number.

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Walter Kruzel to Approve ATP-0035 – Add - \$3,230.00 – Electrical Work Associated with Changes in Furniture Layout in Business Classrooms  
Seconded by Jim Nasuta

Dean states we met with Business 3 or 4 times prior to bid. We produced our documents and everyone signs off. Business again was met within the last few weeks. After looking at the plan they decided they wanted to take two classrooms, one is a computer lab and one is a general business classroom and flip the two of them. By flipping them we moved the computer lab about 50 feet further from the panel where they were home running that lab. There are about 8 home runs for that lab. Ferguson said it would be about another 500 feet of wire, plus hangers, plus labor. By shifting the two classrooms it shifts power and data associated with it from the panel.

Doug states he can understand the cost difference. My question is I thought we locked in all the rooms?

Tim Neville states he wants to hear the answer to that question, too. Why are we doing this now?

Art states there was a change in department heads and it was cheaper to move the electrical than to move the sink.

Dean states the sink was the driving factor. There is only one room that has a sink in it and is a limitation on the building. They had asked for one sink and we couldn't get anymore sinks in. We decided early on it would be in the computer lab. The new department head said no, I really don't want the sink in the computer lab, I really want the sink in the general classroom. We can't move the sink because it is under an unexcavated portion. The sink had to stay where it was. Instead of re-routing the plumbing which would be many more thousands.

Doug asks what if we didn't shift at all? That was always a computer lab with a sink?

Dean states yes, then the sink would stay in the computer lab. The new department head asked for the sink to be in the non-computer lab.

Doug states cap the plumbing and delete the sink.

Tim asks Andy if he knew anything about this?

Andy states it happened before he got here.

Tim asks if the Superintendent knows about this? We asked them 3 or 4 times. We told them this is it. Because we change to new personnel is not a reason.

George states it had nothing to do with personnel. I don't think originally the plan was for it to be a computer room.

Dean states it is a computer lab specifically for the business department. It has always been a business computer lab and that was the room designated to have the sink all the way back 8 months ago. The department head at the time said I want a sink in this room, which was the computer lab. The new department head said let's shift those two spaces.

Tim asks why do they need a sink in the other room?

Dean states I don't know from a functionality standpoint of why they need a sink. I can tell you from day one they always wanted a sink in one of their business classrooms. The program always had one sink in one of the classrooms. I never asked what they do in there.

Randy states what if we say no, we don't want to switch it? Is it a done deal?

Amar states this is in A-wing. We haven't even started.

Tim states he'd like to have a discussion with Art because his theory it is \$3,200.00. If we do one, we will be doing others. Mr. Rypysc you were absolutely adamant that once they signed off this is it.

Walter suggests we table and get more information.

George states in the marketing classes they paint and make signs. They needed a sink.

Motion made by Greg Strich to Table ATP-0035 Pending Further Research

Seconded by Walter Kruzel

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Doug Maxellon to Approve ATP-0040 – Add - \$11,331.00 – Removal of Asbestos Damp Proofing at LL-C2

Seconded by Walter Kruzel

Art states this is asbestos damp proofing they found on the wall behind the freezers in the area beneath the cafeteria. When you come in the loading dock they have a set of freezers down there for the food services program. When they demo'd the area they found a wall of asbestos.

Doug asks if we are demo'ing the area?

Amar states we demo'd the coolers, we uncovered the area and abated. It is an estimated number. The work is completed. We will present as a fixed number later on.

Dean states the coolers are out and the walls are coming down. It is an NTE (not to exceed).

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Walter Kruzel to Approve ATP-0041 – Add - \$11,451.00 – Footing at E Line along Existing Building

Seconded by Jim Nasuta

Dean states this is a footing along what we call E-Line to where the Fermi Wing and the existing building abut each other. We showed a thickened slab at that location. When they excavated the existing footing was down deeper than our original drawings showed they were set at. The decision was made to modify our detail, pour a new footing along the entire A building. We authorized that approval to proceed. The \$11,451 is being negotiated.

Doug states they are all measureable costs?

Amar states yes.

Motion made by Walter Kruzel to Amend his motion to Not to Exceed

Motion passes by a show of hands

Motion made by Walter Kruzel to Approve ATP-0023 (Revision) – Oil Tank Removal

Amar states the original ATP estimate was \$92,912.00 to proceed with the work. Since then we encountered ground water. They determined the interior as well as exterior water had petroleum trace deemed as contaminated. The cost included removal of the tank, back filling the area. We reconciled the cost and we are at \$158,700.00 and \$54,000.00 of that is the environmental mitigation portion of the work. Clean Harbor was working for Mizzy under their direction and guidance. The work is completed.

Doug asks what is the mark up on general conditions?

Amar states 10% general conditions. It is not a lump sum agreement. You can approve it Not to Exceed. Clean Harbor has taxed their work. We're challenging it. The project is tax exempt. Some services you have to pay tax.

Walter Kruzel Amends the Motion to Not To Exceed

Seconded by Doug Maxellon

Motion passes by a show of hands

Doug states the request for a coversheet explaining ATP's came from him when talking with Art. We spent a lot of time talking about the changes. It would be helpful if there was a coversheet explaining the ATP's.

Randy would rather they explain it to us. Walter agrees.

Doug continues someone should be signing off on the pricing that it is agreeable. If we get an audit. It will go back to who is authorizing it. Seems like no accountability here. No one in between. Someone should be accountable with a name.

Dean states we are signing off, Bob Washburn from our office when the ATP is approved. We are signing off as a formal ATP then as the formal change order. We as the construction administrator are signing off. We're the last one to see it.

Doug asks if Gilbane does a spreadsheet and if so as we're approving them can we get a copy of it? All the ATP's should be consistent.

Amar states they do. I will give you the information. We forecast all the time.

Discussion/direction on Budget Sub-committee member request for discussion of Power Pole issue.

Doug states it doesn't make sense. I'd rather see a floor cut.

Dean states we are slab on grade. No basement below. That particular room where I didn't have the ability to chop up the slab. We were looking to save money.

Doug states I'd like to see a cost.

Randy states it may be a computer lab this year and not next year. With power poles you could just disconnect.

Amar states I have walls that have PCB's you would have to cut through. I can give you a rough estimate number vs. power poles. I will email Art a number, estimated.

Dean states it is a unique location.

Tim states the cost is the deciding factor.

**6. EXECUTIVE SESSION:** None

Motion to Adjourn by Greg Strich

Seconded by Walter Kruzel

Motion passes by a show of hands

Adjourned at 7:32 PM